

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

This application is directed to systems and methods for creating a display card such as an easily produced photographic identification card, and to various systems and methods for advantageously using that card.

By this amendment, several claims are canceled. Claims 1-25, 28-34, 52, 54-57, 60, and 137-138 remain pending. The independent claims are: claims 1, 16, 20, 34, 52, 54, and 137. All claims are various rejected in view of the cited references:

Zagami '907 (6,801,907)  
St. Vrain (7,028,012)  
Zagami '356 (6,394,356)  
Haas (6,197,396)

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Office Action, which has been studied with interest and care. Applicants further thank the Examiner for the courtesy shown during the Examiner Interview conducted August 16, 2006. During the Examiner Interview the Applicants' undersigned representative pointed out various subject matter in the remaining independent claims, and why that subject matter was not disclosed or suggested by the references. The Examiner courteously indicated preliminary concurrence regarding the claims discussed, pending further analysis and possible additional prior art searching by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the Amendments and the remarks presented during the Examiner Interview and herein is respectfully requested.

### **II. THE REMAINING INDEPENDENT CLAIMS**

**Claim 1.** Claim 1 was rejected as obvious over Zagami '907 in view of St. Vrain.

In response to the first Office Action, claim 1 was previously amended to generally incorporate the subject matter of claim 10, namely, that the system presents to the user a preview of the identification card, with the preview being updated upon entry of each letter of the user's name.

Neither the first Office Action nor the second Office Action pointed out where within the references this particular subject matter is disclosed, or otherwise discuss this subject matter.

This subject matter of updating an identification card preview upon entry of each letter of the visitor's name is important because it allows the visitor to preview his identification card as it is being "built" by the system. This helps reduce a visitor's anxiety about using an unfamiliar system, and helps assure the visitor that he is operating the system properly. Increasing a user's comfort level is especially helpful in connection with an identification badging system because proving identity and being badged can be an inherently intimidating process to some visitors to a facility, and because the user is less likely to require assistance in operating the system if he can see the progress of the badging process and know that he is operating the system properly.

The references do not disclose or suggest "updat[ing] an identification card preview upon entry of each letter of the user's name" as claimed. Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

In the Examiner Interview of August 16, 2006, the Examiner courteously indicated that the subject matter of updating the badge preview upon entry of each letter, as claimed in Claim 1, appears to present subject matter that patentably distinguishes over the prior art cited. Applicants appreciate the indication, and as with all other limitations discussed during the Examiner Interview, understand that the Examiner's indication is preliminary, pending a closer review of the cited references and possible additional prior art searching by the Examiner.

**Claim 16.** Claim 16 was previously generally rewritten into independent form. Claim 16 recites that the user inputs his email address upon a first visit, the system stores his name and photograph in connection with the email address, and upon a second visit the user merely needs to enter his email address whereupon the system recalls the stored photograph, name, and possibly other information, and uses that data to create a second identification card. This greatly expedites the creation of a photographic identification badge for repeat visitors.

The Examiner cited Zagami '356 as teaching a badging system wherein the system prompts the user upon a first visit to enter an email address and the system stores the retained data in association with the email address; and upon a second and subsequent visit by the user the user can enter the email address whereupon the system will recall the retained data in printing a second

identification badge (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Applicants respectfully disagree. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Zagami '356 of using an email address so that a visitor upon a second visit to a facility only needs to enter an email address in order to have a badge printed.

In the Examiner Interview, Applicants emphasized the novel subject matter of using an email address as the index for repeat visitors so that a repeat visitor to a company lobby or similar area does not need to re-enter his name, address, company affiliation, or similar information. The Examiner preliminarily indicated that subject matter appears to be novel over the cited prior art. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication.

**Claim 137.** Claim 137 recites similar subject matter as Claim 16. Specifically, Claim 137 recites that the system “prompts a subsequent user to input an email address, and if the email address input by the subsequent user matches the first user’s email address, causes a printer to print a photographic identification badge featuring at least some information corresponding to said first user.” For the same reasons as discussed with respect to Claim 16, Claim 137 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

**Claim 20.** Claim 20 was previously generally rewritten into independent form. Claim 20 recites that the information printed onto the ID card “includes information previously entered via interaction with an electronic messaging and calendaring system.”

Neither the first Office Action nor the second Office Action addressed this subject matter, or state where within the cited references the subject matter is disclosed or rendered obvious. The undersigned has carefully studied the cited references, and has found no teaching or suggestion to populate the ID card with information that has been at least, in part, obtained from an electronic messaging and calendaring system.

As but one possible example of the advantageous use of an electronic messengering and calendaring system to populate in part an identification badge, a meeting organizer can send a meeting notice to a number of requested meeting attendees including attendees at various companies. The meeting notice request can be linked to the contact information for each of those potential attendees. Then, when the attendees arrive at the facility lobby to check in for the meeting, much of the information for each of the visitors’ badges is already linked to the badge creation system thereby

eliminating the need for the visitors to enter all of that information. For example, the visitors could enter merely their email addresses, and the system could then pull up all of the relevant information for that visitor (e.g., name, company, the meeting organizer as site contact, etc.) and print that information on the badges without further text input by the visitors. This is a highly advantageous feature that is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, the claim is allowable over the prior art.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner courteously indicated that this subject matter appears to be neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference.

**Claim 34.** Claim 34 was previously rewritten into independent form. Claim 34 recites that the system keeps a list of visitors who are present in the facility based in part on the badges that have been created and the badges that have been scanned out upon egress from the facility, and that “the list is sent electronically to an emergency governmental entity.” This feature is useful when, for example, a fire department has been called and the fire department wants to ensure that the building has been cleared, and that all personnel including visitors are safe and accounted for.

In support of the rejection of Claim 34, the Examiner has cited Zagami ‘907 (Col. 11, lines 20+) as disclosing “generating reports” regarding the users. The reference, however, appears to merely disclose entry and exit logs kept on a computer, and generating lists of how many passengers, crew members, or other individuals are on a passenger cruise ship at a time. The purpose is for allowing the cruise ship operator to know who is on the ship and who is off the ship at any given time.

In contrast, the claim recites the specific subject matter of sending electronically a list of persons present within a facility to an emergency governmental entity. This goes far beyond merely keeping a log on a computer. This subject matter is neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed patent distinguishes over the prior art. During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner courteously indicated that this subject matter appears to be neither disclosed nor suggested by the reference.

**Claim 52.** Claim 52 as previously amended recites that a person at a remote location, such as a remotely located guard for example, allows the visitor to access the facility upon successful creation of the ID badge.

The Office Action cites Zagami '907 in rejecting the claim, but does not specify where the recited subject matter is disclosed within Zagami. Applicants respectfully disagree. Zagami teaches that after a cruise ship ID badge is created using a photo registration station, "[t]he passenger would then take the card and use it for entering or exiting of the vessel . . ." (col. 10, lines 60-62). Zagami '907 does not disclose or suggest that the ship will no longer need guards at the ship's entrances. Rather, it appears that the guards will be placed at the entrances to the ship as usual, but that the guards will have computer monitors to display the photographs previously taken and encoded onto the cards or indexed by codes on the cards, so that the guard can compare the photo of the person entering the ship to the photo previously taken. See col. 5, lines 60-62. Applicants suggest that Zagami '907 implicitly teaches away from having someone at a remote facility to allow access or not allow access, because on a cruise ship as discussed by Zagami '907 it would create an unacceptable bottleneck to have each person individually admitted or denied entrance to the cruise ship by a remote guard remotely locking or unlocking a door for each person to enter, after the person has posed long enough in front of a television camera for a remotely located guard to compare the person to his retrieved photograph. In any event, Zagami '907 clearly does not disclose that his system can be used to eliminate guards at the entrances to cruise ship.

Furthermore, even if Zagami '907 had suggested eliminated entrance guards, which he did not, Zagami '907 would merely teach allowing access based upon a *presenting* of a previously created badge. Claim 52, in contrast, recites the remote operator allowing the visitor entrance to the facility *upon successful creation of the ID badge*, not upon showing or scanning of a badge previously created. Claim 53 as amended therefore patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner courteously indicated that the recited subject matter appears to distinguish over the prior art. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of apparent allowability.

**Claims 54 and 56.** Claim 54 recites that a single remote attendant communicates electronically with visitors at multiple entrances to provide assistance to them if necessary in making

identification cards for themselves; claim 56 specifies that the communication includes two-way voice communication. The Examiner has rejected these claims on the ground that Zagami '907 provides for assistance in making badges by audible two-way communication (col. 10, lines 32+).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Zagami '907 merely discloses that a photo registration kiosk includes "[a]n external speaker 436 [ ] provided for audio prompts, if desired." (Col. 10, lines 32-33) That is, the photo registration kiosk can provide both visual and audio prompts such as, "Please enter your last name now." Zagami '907 does not disclose two-way audible communication. Zagami '907 does not disclose any type of human intervention and assistance for the user if the user experiences difficulty in using the system. Accordingly, claims 54 and 56 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner courteously indicated that the above-identified subject matter appears to distinguish over the prior art. Applicants indicate the appreciation of apparent allowability.

**Claim 57.** Claim 57 depends from claim 54 and adds that the assistance provided by a remote attendant includes the remote attendant sending commands to the computer thereby rendering it unnecessary for the visitor to enter certain data that would otherwise be required in order for him to make a badge for himself. For example, if a visitor is having trouble understanding how to operate the system, the remote attendant could "take over" the badge making station remotely, ask via the two-way voice communication for the visitor's name and other required data, enter that information at the remote attendant's own terminal and thereby to the badge making station, thus assuring that the badge making process is completed and in a timely manner.

The recited subject matter of allowing a remote attendant to take over the badge making station is important at least because it allows an attendant to be located remotely yet still provide assistance if necessary for the user to create his own badge. Part of the purpose of the system is to allow users to make their own badges and thereby eliminating, if the company deems it desirable, the guard from each visitor entrance. In this way, a single human guard can effectively guard a large number of facility entrances which previously required a separate guard to be physically present at each station. This results in a great cost saving to the company.

The Examiner has rejected claim 57, citing Zagami '907 at col. 10, lines 10-32. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passage does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 57. Zagami '907 does not disclose a remote assistance for the user during the badge making process, much less that a remote attendant can take over the badge-making computer in the manner claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that claim 57 is allowable over the prior art.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner courteously indicated that this subject matter appears to distinguish over the cited references. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of apparent allowability.

**Remaining Claims.** All remaining pending claims not specifically discussed herein depend from independent claims which have been discussed, and are patentable for at least the reasons stated with respect to the independent claims.

### CONCLUSIONS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and efforts to work with the Applicants in moving this application towards allowance of the subject matter which is not disclosed by the references. Allowance of all remaining claims is earnestly solicited.


The undersigned attorney can be reached at 310-590-4528 to facilitate prosecution of this application, if necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW OFFICE OF  
JOEL D. VOELZKE

DATED: August 17, 2006

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joel D. Voelzke  
Registration No. 37,957

400 Corporate Pointe, Suite 300  
Culver City, CA 90230

Serial No. 10/662,758  
Amendment dated August 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 11, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 110-008  
(formerly 310048-750)

Tel: (310) 590-4525  
Fax: (310) 590-4526

